

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 93 19:11:10 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #1120
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Mon, 20 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 1120

Today's Topics:

hdn releases
need expert info on nicads.
Neighborhood watch groups
RS HTX202 warning
Who Wrote Scratchi?
writing speed

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sun, 19 Sep 1993 18:57:00
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.kei.com!news.oc.com!utacfd.uta.edu!rwsys!ocitor!FredGate@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: hdn releases
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

i received e-mail that ftp.fidonet.org was denying access .. while i look into
this .. please use ftp.ieee.org until the problem is resolved..

lee - wa5eha
hdn coordinator

* Origin: Com Port 1 DFW Amateur Radio BBS (214) 226-1181 (1:124/7009)

Date: 20 Sep 1993 17:25:07 GMT

From: concert!gatech!usenet.ufl.edu!eng.ufl.edu!helios.tcad.ee.ufl.edu!
thoman@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: need expert info on nicads.
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CDKp9t.7IE@fc.hp.com>, myers@fc.hp.com (Bob Myers) writes:
|>
|> Good Lord! Here we are on the NiCd memory myth (and all the junk that
|> goes with it) AGAIN?

You mean you're surprised? The whole idea is so deeply entrenched that it may never be possible to correct everybody. Someone recently suggested that the attendant info be collected into a FAQ, and if anybody can find your previous posting and some of the other fact-based traffic on the subject, I hope it happens!

In the meantime, the Crusades will continue...

Greg Thoman: The opinions expressed herein are mine alone, and I am solely irresponsible for them.

Date: 20 Sep 93 23:17:51 GMT
From: mulvey!root@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Neighborhood watch groups
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

John R. Moore (john@anasazi.com) wrote:
: nu7i@indirect.com (Darrell Shandrow) writes:

: >The neighborhood watch is a great application of amateur radio. I don't
: >think that it is necessary to get permission from a repeater group before
: >using it on such an event. This is even if that repeater is the local
: >chat box. We must remember that amateur radio is a service first and a
: >chat box secondly or maybe evenn chatting should be as low as the third or
: >least important levels.

: As an owner of repeaters (ie, part owner of Northlink), I strongly
: disagree. ANYTIME you plan to regularly use a repeater for a net,
: you should ask permission of the owner.

: If a block watch group showed up on Northlink regularly, we would ask
: them to leave (or system is statewide). If a block watch group shows up
: on ANY repeater, they are likely to be asked to leave. The repeater wasn't
: set up for block watch. If you ask the owner AHEAD of time, he might
: agree, if it isn't incompatible with the intended use of the repeater.

: And before you flame me about the public service aspect of ham radio,
: let me remind you that there are MANY different aspects of ham radio,
: and some repeaters may exist for a very specific function (such as
: DX spotting). Furthermore, other public service/safety functions that
: you don't even know about may be going on. For example, one Northlink
: repeater was put in specifically at the request of the National Weather
: Service for skywarn. If we have a big storm going, we don't want a bunch
: of neighborhood watchers on their reporting that everything is normal!

: A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
: on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

: >I participate in a walk with my blindness organization and we don't seek
: >permission since we don't know really whether or not we'll need the use of
: >a repeater. Of course, I probably wouldn't break into a busy repeater but
: >I figure anyone who wouldn't want us to do a public service event with
: >their repeater better have a legitimate service-related reason. 73 for
: >now.

: You really don't understand private property rights, apparently.

: --

: DISCLAIMER: These views are mine alone, and do not reflect my employer's!
: John Moore 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 USA (602-951-9326)
: john@anasazi.com Amateur call:NJ7E Civil Air Patrol:Thunderbird 381
: - - Support ALL ...erk glugh mmpph.... Memory fault (core dumped)

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 93 17:58:12 GMT
From: ncrgw2.ncr.com!ncrhub2!torynews!kevin@uunet.uu.net
Subject: RS HTX202 warning
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CDMG9x.FDo@telemax.com> macy@telemax.com writes:
>
>I've had this happen on Yaesu and Icom radios. Plastic only has
>limited strength. The RS unit is heavier than the mini handhelds
>as well. A wrist strap can impart a false sense of security with
>anyheld, at best its a safety against fumble fingering the unit.
>At worst, someone letting the HT swing freely may be in for a nasty
>surprise...
>

I just use the wrist strap for what it surely is intended: as a "safety net"
in case I let go my grip on the radio itself.

--
[] [] [] [] Kevin Sanders, KN6FQ NCR Torrey Pines
[] [] [] [] kevin.sanders@torreypinesca.ncr.com (619) 597-3602
[] [] [] [] kevin%beacons@cyber.net
[] [] [] [] []
[] [] [] [] [] Dump MS-DOS. Prevent Programmer Burnout with Linux.

Date: 20 Sep 1993 16:54:36 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!news.bbn.com!bbn.com!
levin@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Who Wrote Scratchi?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jh25s56@sycom.mi.org (Jim Harvey) writes:

|Can't remember what the fellow's name was but he also wrote a series in
|Popular Electronics, something like Tom and Jerry's adventures in radio.

Ah, yes, Carl and Jerry. That was my favorite thing in that magazine
when I was in high school; much later I was quite disappointed to see
it was gone.

That was why I was so fond of Jim Kearman's(*) stories that ran in some
of last year's QST.

/JBL

(*)It may have been someone else who posts on Usenet from ARRL.HQ -
I've screwed this up before, sorry if I did it again.

=
Nets: levin@bbn.com | "A religion that must depend upon the state to do
pots: (617)873-3463 | what it cannot do is not worthy of existence."
KD1ON (@KB4N.NH.USA) | -- Robert H. Meneilly

Date: 20 Sep 93 18:56:36 GMT
From: ogicse!hp-cv!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!srigenprp!
alanb@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: writing speed
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Derek Wills (oo7@emx.cc.utexas.edu) wrote:
: randy@cyphyn.radnet.com (Randy someone) says:

: >>....I can not write faster than 6-7 WPM...and type even worse!
:
: >>HOW in blazes do people DO 20 wpm writing it down? The copy must look awful!
:

:
: I don't believe that you cannot write faster than 6-7 wpm unless you
: have some physical handicap, as that is one word every 8-10 seconds,
: and little kids just learning to write can go that fast.

20 wpm is not hard to do, especially if you write longhand. (Printing is slower). I did once manage to get my 40 wpm certificate writing longhand, although I practiced for weeks beforehand.

AL N1AL

Date: 20 Sep 93 17:21:14 +0200
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!uwm.edu!rpi!ghost.dsi.unimi.it!univ-
lyon1.fr!scsing.switch.ch!sun.rediris.es!power.ci.uv.es!lulu.uab.es!cc.uab.es!
ikbe0@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <m9c3n8INNar@exodus.Eng.Sun.COM>, <277h5f\$5j1@bigguy.eng.ufl.edu>, <6851@gos.ukc.ac.uk>
Subject : Re: need expert info on nicads.

> [Cue religious debate :-]
>
> This effect does exist - I know because I've observed it.
>
> I bought my RC gear a year-or-so before I was finally in a position to
> get back into flying, and during that period I would occasionally give
> the batteries a top-up charge. Before using the gear in anger I bought
> a cycler - it discharges the pack to a safe low level, lighting an LED
> bar graph as it goes, and then recharges the pack.
>
> On the first cycle (after an overnight trickle charge) the RX battery
> managed something like 60% of its stated capacity, on the second it
> managed (I think - this was some time ago) 80%, and only on the third
> attempt did it manage 100%. The TX battery behaved in a similar manner.
>
> So yes, the effect is real - a fact that I thought was generally
> accepted nowadays...
> -----

Excuse me, but this is a different matter. All new batteries need several "charge-discharge" cycles to reach their full capacity.

BTW, several weeks ago there were three or four posting from zrepachol@cc.curtin.edu.au, in rec.photo, dealing with the care and feeding of nicd's. If the author, or anyone out there that has kept them, can repost them, we are going to appreciate it very much.

Sorry, english is not my first language,

Javier Castro
ikbe0@cc.uab.es

Date: Tue, 21 Sep 1993 01:16:27 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!e2big.mko.dec.com!regent.enet.dec.com!gettys@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep12.145543.27988@gsm001.mendelson.com>, <27iph3\$99a@access.digex.net>, <1993Sep20.040357.5405@news.uiowa.edu>
Subject : Re: HTX-202 battery life?

In article <1993Sep20.040357.5405@news.uiowa.edu>, drenze@icaen.uiowa.edu (Douglas J Renze) writes...

>bote@access.digex.net (John Boteler) writes:

>

>>Geoffrey S. Mendelson <gsmlrn@gsm001.mendelson.com> wrote:

>>>ODONNELL@MAR65.MAR.ORA.FDA.GOV (Paul WB20YC) writes:

>>>I only use ICOM and compatible battery packs on mine. The R/S ones sit on the
>>>self for emergencies. Note that at 35ma (25ma with power saver) this guys
>>>use about 1/6 the power on receive than any of my icom rigs use.

>

>Question: From the WB6NOA review of the HTX-202, I got the impression that the
>ICOM battery packs wouldn't lock onto the '202. Any comments? Is this
>true? How do you get around this? I've been thinking about building the
>battery pack from the last ish of QST for the one I'm buying and putting
>the voltage regulator into the alkaline battery holder. Has anybody done
>this? How well does it work?

>

>--

>__ /| | Douglas J Renze | Charter Member, Popular Front

>\'o.0' | +1 319 337 4664 | for Revolutionary Darwinism:

>=(____)= | drenze@isca.uiowa.edu | Evolution Now!

> U | Douglas-Renze@uiowa.edu |

The old style of 2AT did NOT lock on. The newer style plus the other rigs did. Good luck.

/s/ Bob N1BRM

Date: 20 Sep 1993 18:12:18 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo2!mcduffle@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep18.071614.9294@indirect.com>, <john.748365714@misty>, <1993Sep20.134233.12758@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: Neighborhood watch groups

lkollar@nyx.cs.du.edu (Larry Kollar) writes:

>This is probably a tempest in a teapot... it should be no problem to find
>a friendly repeater. F'r example, a friend of mine has a repeater set up
>on a Forest Service tower in north Georgia and justifies it by saying it's
>for emergency/public service use. I haven't asked him, but I'd bet he'd
>welcome a neighborhood watch group for that very reason. (The repeater
>also hosts a weekly county ARES net, but that's another topic.)

The key is "he'd welcome a neighborhood watch group". He approves the use of that (his) equipment for that purpose, at that time.

>Anyway...

>john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

>>A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
>>on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

>This I strongly agree with. Although I munched the relevant text, I also
>agree that Northlink (& other linked repeater groups) are not the place
>for local/neighborhood exercises. However, if you're a repeater owner
>and do not want a public service group on your machine, it's only common
>courtesy (dare I say "obligation"?) to help that group find a more suitable
>(or more accommodating) repeater.

>--

>Larry Kollar, KC4WZK

I strongly disagree with the last statement. Why should I (or anyone else) be obligated to find you another repeater to use? Scout around and find it on your own...and ASK the owner if your use would rub him

the wrong way (before you use it for that purpose unless it is an emergency).

73, Gary

Date: Mon, 20 Sep 1993 16:08:04 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!stevew@decwrl.dec.com
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <04=z0yg@dixie.com>, <!cbztcq@dixie.com>, <1993Sep15.222727.9179@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Emergency: cellular vs ham (was Re: Yagi for Cellular Phone?)

In article <1993Sep15.222727.9179@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

> In article <stevewCDEIAK.MKs@netcom.com> stevew@netcom.com (Steven Wilson) writes:
> >my discussion of SVECS removed....
> >no politics!
>
> Well that's good, but a simple repeater system isn't what I meant
> when I talked about modern cooperative communications systems.
> We have several wide coverage machines here in the Atlanta area
> that are always available for emergency use. The North Fulton
> machine that John made fun of is one. (It really does sound like
> stuff below this removed for brevity sake...

I mentioned SVECS as a cooperative amateur association as an existance proof that it can happen with a group directly tied to ARES. Further, I would contend that such a cooperative group who's real unique feature is a membership from a wide geographic area would more easily adopt/adapt to new systems. Let's suppose that after another couple years we start seeing trunking systems retired from general service and appearing at swap meets. A group like SVECS would have the organizational setup to implement this "newer" technology more easily than some other groups mostly because of the lack of political in-fighting. Granted "trunking systems" aren't the latest thing in communications, but they would be new to amateurs and certainly make a better use of our existing spectrum.

> But none of this is linked with ARES. In fact ARES eventually
> got chased off the North Fulton machine as a place to conduct
> their drills, though they're still welcome for real operations.
> That's a personality problem with the ARES leaders pure and simple.

Doesn't it really resolve down to this? If you put someone in

charge that is going to build a little empire for themselves then they are almost setting themselves up for a falling out someplace with someone. Worse yet is when it is with the served agency. Such individuals suffer from NIH usually and that is just exactly what you DON'T present to a served agency.

My whole contention is that what may exist locally for you guys doesn't necessarily exist through out the US, and further, that for the most part it doesn't exist here as proof of the claim.

> >The other example that comes to mind are the various long-haul linking
> >systems in place in CA. We have at least 3 systems I can think of
> >that provide VHF/UHF linking up and down CA. (That is like linking
> >Philly with Miami!) There are numerous repeater groups who have
> >gotten together to make this happen. So there are successful
> >cooperative groups in amateur radio. There is hope!
>
> Well we have the Big Shanty system with links from Atlanta to
> Chattanooga (and beyond I think), and another linking group
> that routinely ties a network together from Nashville to Jacksonville
> with stops in Alabama. But it's all very ad hoc and iffy. There are no
> systems in place to use it effectively.

Here is a real difference. The above systems are PERMANENTLY in place. Two of the three systems I'm thinking of are ALWAYS on. The Condor system which is pretty well known in CA was probably the first way the amateurs in LA, et al, new what really happened in SF during the Loma Prietta quake. We have been known to lash together things for wide area conferencing capabilities, or creating linked bridges for the duration of emergencies also. Two examples. During Loma Prietta, a 450 lash up was created to tie the Bay area to Sacramento. A couple high level machines where placed into service to reach over the hills that separate the Bay area from the central valley. Another time we had a group of people dispatched from here to a point about 150 miles up the coast where a pretty major firre was going on. A system of 450 machines was temporarily put together to provide logistics service between the fire area and Santa Clara. All of the above was very adhoc as opposed to the permanent systems. The differences here had mostly to due with geography. The permanent systems are setup to link the metro areas, and the main highways along the coast. The alternate bridging for the fire for instance was needed because of both the distance and the mountains in-between. Oddly enough notice all of the above was done on UHF instead of resorting to 40m ;-)

> >> It's true that many amateurs have mastered the art of soldering
> >> a connector, and some even know which end of a beam is the front,
> >> but how many can quickly set up an ad hoc interface between an

> >> agency communications system and an amateur system? How many
> >> can quickly and accurately solve a network problem for an agency?
> >> How many can even quickly adapt to an agency's operating protocols?
> >> How many can discard their normal amateur competitive training and
> >> adopt a cooperative approach? As agency support personnel, our
> >> job is to fit seamlessly and transparently our communications
> >> assets into the agency's systems. How many even know what their
> >> local agency's systems are? How many even know what it means to
> >> operate over a trunked communications system?
>
> >Boy you walked into this time ;-) I can easily say just about
> >ANY member of my local group and a fair percentage of the local
> >amateurs can do any of the above at the expert level...whoops...
> >but then I live in Sillicon Valley ;-)
>
> >Let me propose an alternative question... within most groups
> >is there a resevoir of such talent? Can someone in your
> >area that you can call handle an ethernet question, or knows
> >how to use a computer beyond just an elementary level?
> >That is a serious question to think about. I can take the answer
> >to the above for granted...but someone located in the middle of
> >Nebraska farm country probably can't.
>
> Well we can take the answer for a given here too. At least among
> the members of my group and others here in Silicon Valley East.
> But that's not the kind of network I meant. Our local police
> systems are 800 MHz trunked systems, data and voice, with
> microwave links and computer supervision. I can only name *one*
> amateur in our area with experience with trunked networks, and
> he got that by working for the supplier. Only a few have test
> equipment covering the band. Most hams don't have a clue. Even
> shadow areas for normal repeaters routinely stump many hams.
> There's no provision for an orderly handoff to another machine,
> automatic *or* manual. And shadow zones are very common in our
> rough terrain.

Gary... I live in a valley within a state full of REAL mountains ;-)

My simplest answer to that is...the guys who installed the commercials system here are pretty much all hams. So within our reserve of personnel such things exist. Now the simple practical problem is that if the world falls apart. These few individuals aren't going to be working for ARES they are going to be trying to put the several commercial systems backup. Here is a point of both advantage and disadvantage. We loose the experience of these few people, yet they are spread across many clients where each of our repeaters (and we have better than a hundred locally I'd wager) have individual teams who are only responsible for that one system that they

built. We can get more back on the air quicker than the commercial guys simply because of the numbers. But to answer your question more properly, I can think of 2 guys within my city group of 12 amateurs that could do what you are asking. So yes, I'd say we could interface to the professional hardware REAL quick. In my city it would be real easy too since the ARES repeater is about 2 inches from the city gear.

> We don't have that here. Most ARES members haven't even heard
> of the ICS,

As for ICS...it was invented in CA...most of the ARES management have had full ICS training(short of being qualified PIO's). We don't always use it internally but the real trick is to be able to fit into a system employing it and being familiar with their lexicon of terms, etc. I'd say we've probably accomplished at least this level of integration with our served agencies.

> much less know how to operate under it. Monitoring
> real situations, I frequently hear, "CALLSIGN DE Callsign I'm
> here, what do I do now? CALLSIGN DE Callsign." "Callsign DE CALLSIGN
> Well I don't know. I'll see if I can find somebody to tell me
> what they want. Callsign DE CALLSIGN." "Hey! It's raining over here,
> anybody bring a raincoat?" "CALLSIGN THIS IS CALLSIGN THE OFFICIAL
> ARES CONTROL STATION. STOP MAKING UNIDENTIFIED TRANSMISSIONS.
> CALLSIGN." "Hey Joe, I got a spare raincoat. Where you at?" "CALLSIGN
> CEASE TRANSMISSION CALLSIGN." And so on ad infinitum.

The above happens here too.... but you'll also here a fair number of people correctly using tactical call signs. A matter of how much training is out there...answer...never enough :-(

> >Gary, I wouldn't argue the above. It seems that this mostly
> comes down to politics and dealing with various peoples personal
> ambitions in a structured way. The raw talent is probably
> hiding in there...you gotta go fish it out and organize it
> usefully and cooperatively.
>
> >Any suggestions?
>
> If I knew how, I'd be out doing it instead of here typing. :-(
> Getting cooperation *before* the emergency is the hardest
> job a ham can have.
>
> Gary

It all does come down to how much cooperation is out there. You

know the simplest arguement I found when two people are bickering with each other... You two guys are both trying to achieve the same thing...and are both doing it out of the best intentions. Once they realize that they usually become a bit more coopeative...

That is about the only trick I've learned but....

73's Steve KA6S

Date: 20 Sep 1993 18:05:41 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
moe.ksu.ksu.edu!crcnis1.unl.edu!unlinfo2!mcduffle@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1993Sep14.185007.21606@cyphyn.radnet.com>, <1993Sep18.071614.9294@indirect.com>, <john.748365714@misty>
Subject : Re: Neighborhood watch groups

john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

>nu7i@indirect.com (Darrell Shandrow) writes:

>>The neighborhood watch is a great application of amateur radio. I don't
>>think that it is necessary to get permission from a repeater group before
>>using it on such an event. This is even if that repeater is the local
>>chat box. We must remember that amateur radio is a service first and a
>>chat box secondly or maybe evenn chatting should be as low as the third or
>>least important levels.

>As an owner of repeaters (ie, part owner of Northlink), I strongly
>disagree. ANYTIME you plan to regularly use a repeater for a net,
>you should ask permission of the owner.

>If a block watch group showed up on Northlink regularly, we would ask
>them to leave (or system is statewide). If a block watch group shows up
>on ANY repeater, they are likely to be asked to leave. The repeater wasn't
>set up for block watch. If you ask the owner AHEAD of time, he might
>agree, if it isn't incompatible with the intended use of the repeater.

>And before you flame me about the public service aspect of ham radio,
>let me remind you that there are MANY different aspects of ham radio,
>and some repeaters may exist for a very specific function (such as
>DX spotting). Furthermore, other public service/safety functions that
>you don't even know about may be going on. For example, one Northlink
>repeater was put in specifically at the request of the National Weather
>Service for skywarn. If we have a big storm going, we don't want a bunch

>of neighborhood watchers on their reporting that everything is normal!

>A repeater belongs to someone. If you want to use it for YOUR group,
>on a regular bases, ASK. It's only common courtesy.

>>I participate in a walk with my blindness organization and we don't seek
>>permission since we don't know really whether or not we'll need the use of
>>a repeater. Of course, I probably wouldn't break into a busy repeater but
>>I figure anyone who wouldn't want us to do a public service event with
>>their repeater better have a legitimate service-related reason. 73 for
>>now.

>You really don't understand private property rights, apparently.

Right on! I was about to reply in a like manner to him but you beat me to it and were a little more civilized than I would have been (but then, everyone knows that:))

He seems to think that every repeater is put there for people to use how they see fit. As you said, in many cases, this isn't true. While emergency traffic should be handled by any repeater without complaint, the routine use, without asking the owners permission, would be intolerable and the system would eventually be shut off if they didn't leave when asked.

73, Gary

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #1120
